

To: Karen Schwinn/R9/USEPA/US@EPA;"Nepstad, Michael G SPK"
[Michael.G.Nepstad@usace.army.mil]; Nepstad, Michael G SPK"
[Michael.G.Nepstad@usace.army.mil]
Cc: "Jewell, Michael S SPK" [Michael.S.Jewell@usace.army.mil]; Smith, Chip R Mr CIV
USA ASA CW" [chip.smith1@us.army.mil]; Salt, Rock" [rock.salt@us.army.mil]; rin
Foresman/R9/USEPA/US@EPA;Tom Hagler/R9/USEPA/US@EPA[]; om
Hagler/R9/USEPA/US@EPA[]
From: "Robershotte, Paul J SPD"
Sent: Fri 6/24/2011 6:26:03 PM
Subject: RE: BDCP CWA/408/10 MOU (UNCLASSIFIED)

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Caveats: NONE

Karen

Yes, it was Dale H-F that specifically asked the status of the Purpose & Need. I shared that we had hoped that we might include the P & N in the MOU, and that the Purpose was pretty close (needed to capture the original 2009 NOI Plus, EPA concern, plus the Oct 2010 Lead Agency response). David Nawi was sending Dale the Oct 2010 letter. Further, that the Bureau was to revisit Chapter 2 and propose the changes they wanted to make to "Need" and get that submitted. I think that is where we are. DWR is supportive in getting involved and getting this advanced.

Paul

-----Original Message-----

From: Schwinn.Karen@epamail.epa.gov [mailto:Schwinn.Karen@epamail.epa.gov]
Sent: Friday, June 24, 2011 11:15 AM
To: Robershotte, Paul J SPD; Nepstad, Michael G SPK
Cc: Jewell, Michael S SPK; Smith, Chip R Mr CIV USA ASA CW; Salt, Rock;
Foresman.Erin@epamail.epa.gov; Hagler.Tom@epamail.epa.gov
Subject: Re: BDCP CWA/408/10 MOU (UNCLASSIFIED)

Thanks Paul! I agree with point #5. Wouldn't next step on that be a submittal from the Lead Agencies, followed by a response from Corps and us? Did David or Mark agree to move forward on that? - Karen

From: "Robershotte, Paul J SPD" [Paul.J.Robershotte@usace.army.mil]
Sent: 06/24/2011 11:07 AM MST
To: "Nepstad, Michael G SPK" <Michael.G.Nepstad@usace.army.mil>
Cc: "Jewell, Michael S SPK" <Michael.S.Jewell@usace.army.mil>; "Smith, Chip R Mr CIV USA ASA CW" <chip.smith1@us.army.mil>; "Salt, Rock" <rock.salt@us.army.mil>; Erin Foresman; Tom Hagler; Karen Schwinn
Subject: BDCP CWA/408/10 MOU (UNCLASSIFIED)

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED

Caveats: NONE

Mike, with cc to Mr Salt, Chip, Mike, Karen, Tom & Erin:

David Nawi & I had a constructive discussion with Mark Cowin, Dale Hoffman-Floerke, and Cathy Caruthers from DWR this morning. The summary of Mark's comments would include:

1. DWR sees the advantages and benefits of addressing NEPA and CWA both at this time;
2. Thus, DWR will pursue being a signatory on the proposed MOU;
3. Recognizing, however, this does not require "pressing reset" on our targeted schedules (and recognizing everyone's process fatigue associated with BDCP);
4. The version we received Wednesday looks quite good, but we will need some time to digest, ask questions, and suggest edits;
5. We see no reason to wait on advancing to Checkpoints identified in the MOU such as agreement on Propose & Need, but do this in parallel with finalizing and signing the MOU.

So, I think we made progress this morning.

Best,

Paul

Paul J Robershotte

Special Advisor

Integrated Water Resource Planning

US Army Corps of Engineers, South Pacific Div

415-503-6639 (office)

415-602-3806 (blackberry)

415-503-6640 (fax)

Building Strong on the Cornerstone of the Southwest!

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED

Caveats: NONE

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED

Caveats: NONE